



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/822,372 04/12/2004		George J. Hobbs	5724-001	2828		
25184	7590	10/11/2005	EXAMINER			
WILLIAM .		_	SAFAVI, N	SAFAVI, MICHAEL		
MACCORD POST OFFIC		-	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
		ACH, NC 28480	3673			

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Application No.		Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary			10/822,372	HOBBS, GEORGE J.					
			Examiner		Art Unit				
			M. Safavi		3673				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication appe	ars on the co	ver sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MINIOR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this component of the provision of the	MAILING DATES of 37 CFR 1.136 munication. statutory period will y will, by statute, co	TE OF THIS (a). In no event, h I apply and will exp ause the application	COMMUNICATION owever, may a reply be tim oire SIX (6) MONTHS from on to become ABANDONED	l. lely filed the mailing date of this c O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on							
,		2b)⊠ This a		final.					
3)□		•			secution as to the	e merits is			
-,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the	application.							
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.								
7)									
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or	election requ	irement.					
Applicati	on Papers								
9)	The specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner.	•						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				obiected to by the E	xaminer.				
,—	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including			•	` ,	FR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected t					• •			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreian n	riority under	35 U.S.C. & 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:				(4) 5. (.).				
,-	1. Certified copies of the priority	documents I	have been re	ceived.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority				on No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies					Stage			
	application from the Internation		-			J			
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action	on for a list of	the certified	copies not receive	d.				
Attachmen	` '		7. ا	7	(DTO 440)				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F	PTO-948)	4) L	_ Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) 🛛 Inforr	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or r No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/17/04</u> .			Notice of Informal Pa)-152)			
S Patent and Tr	ademark Office					<u></u>			

Art Unit: 3673

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hargett in view of either Stolz or Harbeke.

Hargett discloses, Figs. 2-4, a polymer form 10 comprising a plurality of spaced, vertically aligned conduits 16 having upper ends with spacers 12, 14 connecting the conduits, the ends of the form 10 constituting the sidewalls with Fig. 4 showing a rectangular shape. Hargett does not specifically set forth removable caps covering the conduit upper ends.

However, each of Stolz and Harbeke teach utilization of caps covering conduits during concrete pour forming so as to prevent concrete from entering the conduit during the pour. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the Hargett form with caps so as to inhibit concrete from entering the conduit as taught by either of Stolz and Harbeke.

Art Unit: 3673

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hargett in view of either Stolz or Harbeke as applied to claims 1-4 and 6 above, and further in view of Rothberg.

To have formed the modified Hargett form of a thermoplastic polymer would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made as taught by Rothberg at col. 4, line 63.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hargett in view of either Stolz or Harbeke as applied to claims 1-4 and 6 above, and further in view of any of Dirksing, Hasty, Narva, Goth and Szabo.

Hargett as modified by either of Stolz and Harbeke fails to disclose pull-tabs to assist in removal of the caps from the conduits. However, each of Hasty, Narva, Goth and Szabo disclose, as conventional, pull-tabs, 1c of Fig. 1 of Dirksing, 12/14/16 of Hasty, 24 of Narva, 11/21 of Goth, and col. 1, line 46 of Szabo. Therefore, to have formed the modified Hargett form with caps possessing pull tabs, thus allowing easy removal thereof, would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made as taught by any of Dirksing, Hasty, Narva, Goth and Szabo.

Claims 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hargett in view of Reyneveld.

Art Unit: 3673

Hargett discloses, Figs. 2-4, a polymer form 10 comprising a plurality of spaced, vertically aligned conduits 16 having upper ends with spacers 12, 14 connecting the conduits, the ends of the form 10 constituting the sidewalls with Fig. 4 showing a rectangular shape. Hargett does not specifically set forth concrete filling or within the form.

However, Reyneveld teaches, Fig. 1, application and utilization of an outer perimeter form 10 serving to contain concrete 12. Therefore to have utilized an outer perimeter form serving to contain the Hargett concrete particularly during placement thereof, would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made as taught by Reyneveld.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hargett in view of Reyneveld as applied to claims 7-14 above, and further in view of Rothberg.

To have formed the modified Hargett form of a thermoplastic polymer would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made as taught by Rothberg at col. 4, line 63.

Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hargett in view of Reyneveld as applied to claims 7-14 above, and further in view of either of Stolz or Harbeke.

Hargett as modified by Reyneveld does not specifically set forth removable caps covering the conduit upper ends.

However, each of Stolz and Harbeke teach utilization of caps covering conduits during concrete pour forming so as to prevent concrete from entering the conduit during the pour. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the modified Hargett form and method with caps so as to inhibit concrete from entering the conduit as taught by either of Stolz and Harbeke.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hargett in view of Reyneveld and either of Stolz or Harbeke as applied to claims 15-20 above, and further in view of Rothberg.

To have formed the modified Hargett form of a thermoplastic polymer would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made as taught by Rothberg at col. 4, line 63.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Safavi whose telephone number is (571) 272-7046. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thur., 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Shackelford can be reached on (571) 272-7049. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/822,372 Page 6

Art Unit: 3673

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MICHAEL SAFAVI PRIMARY EXAMMER ART UNIT 334